



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,038	04/12/2001	Yasuhiro Nakai	1035-317	2393

23117 7590 11/08/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,038

Applicant(s)

NAKAI ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/1/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant's arguments are directed toward limitations that are so broad that they can read on the operation of a generic computer i.e. the first program controls the basic operation of the apparatus and the second program controls additional operations of the generic computer.

A reference is to be considered not only for what it expressly states, but also for what it would reasonably have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re DeLisle*, 160 USPQ 806 (CCPA 1969). The primary reference, Morishita discloses providing access to additional resources after the system is up and running. Merkle discloses the concept of shareware, which provides for controlled access to additional functions after the program has been initialized. Due to the broad/generic way the claims are written, art that reasonably suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the limitations, will teach to the claims.

Upon further review of the drawings and Specifications, it would appear that the invention being presented is in reference to an image processing device and additional function packs. Incorporation of the image-processing device into the claims would narrow the interpretation of the claims and present a more specific direction in what the inventor's invention is about. As per the Specifications, specific functions provided by the "additional function pack" incorporated into the claims would further limit and possibly render the claims original and non-obvious over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 5, 9, 15 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In re John Covell Collier, 55CCPA-; 397 F.2d 1003; 158 USPQ 266, Claim-Indefiniteness- Combination- Structural Relationships Between Elements not Positively Recited- 35 U.S.C. 112, second Paragraph. The statement in the claims 1, 5, 9 and 15 about intended uses, capabilities, and structures, which will result upon the performance of future acts, is not a positive structural limitation. The claim does not positively recite structural relationships of the elements in its recitation of what may or may not occur. In this sense it fails to comply with section 112, second paragraph, in failing distinctly to claim what applicant presents as his actual invention.

The main fault is indefiniteness in the sense that things, which may be done, are not required to be done. For example, "for controlling", " becomes available", and "can execute", are possibilities of events occurring. These cannot be regarded as structural limitations and therefore not as positive limitations in a claim directed to structure. They cannot therefor be relied on to distinguish from the prior art.

Further, the term "desired" is open for suggestion and does not provide for a distinct, concrete limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishita et al. U.S. Patent 5,968,175 [Morishita], Ginter et al. U.S. Patent 5,910,987 [Ginter], and in further view of Merkle U.S. Patent 6,330,549 [Merkle]

3. As per claims 1 and 5:

4. Morishita discloses:

a program storing section for storing a first program for controlling basic operations of said electronic apparatus so that basic operations of the apparatus are executed by controlling elements of the apparatus via the first program, and a second program that is a subroutine and is accessed in said first program so as to control an additional operation of said electronic apparatus so that the second program controls the additional operation that is different than the basic operations controlled by the first program, wherein the second program becomes available via elements of the apparatus that can execute the basic operations via the first program. Col. 15, lines 50-67, Col. 16, lines 1-67, Col. 20, lines 1-18, and Fig. 14.

a control section for implementing a desired operation by executing only said first program, or both said first and second programs; Col. 4, lines 25-37.

a system managing section that, that renders the additional operation implementable, makes said second program permanently accessible in said first program. Col. 7, lines 5-20.

Morishita discloses the claimed invention except for the system managing section that, response to a releasing key operation. However Morishita teaches about the use of keys for accessing information. Col. 25, lines 37-46, and Col. 34, lines 15-19. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide a releasing key operation. Col. 46-47, lines 1-67. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the software use method control system of Morishita with the releasing key operation of Ginter, in order to provide the control and security required to insure proper protocol is followed to receive the remuneration assigned to the use of the software program.

Morishita discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein said first program is accessible and operable both before and after the releasing key operation. However, the Examiner submits that both the main programs in the Application and the Prior Art remain functional because neither of them teaches about the changes in the original operating program that would affect their accessibility or operability after the releasing operation. In fact, the Examiner submits that the original operating programs of the Application and the Prior Art by definition must maintain their operability because the purpose of the release key operation is to expand/complement the original operating program.

Since the applicant has not disclosed that wherein said first program is accessible and operable both before and after the releasing key operation solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Morishita will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to wherein said first program is accessible and operable both before and after the releasing key operation.

1. In reference to Claim 5, wherein said releasing key operation determines whether the release key information matches release key information stored in memory and if so then making the second program accessible. The Examiner submits that the normal procedure for a release key operation, as shown in the prior art, is a comparison with an internal key within a program, to an externally acquired key from the person desiring to control the use of the program.

In reference to, wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program. It is well known that a person having ordinary skill in the art that the concept of shareware, i.e. providing a demo or short version of a program for non-restricted use, requires a key to access the rest of the program. Morishita teaches about the copyright owner creating protected software, which can be used by his specified use method. Col. 19, lines 50-54. Morishita further teaches encoding a key with the personal ID of the owner, the software ID and the user's personal ID. Col. 25, lines 37-50.

Merkle teaches that it is known in the art to provide wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program. Col. 3, lines 28-50. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the software use control system of Morishita with the wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program of Merkle, in order to promote the use of the program by providing a demo or short version of a program for non-restricted use.

As per claims 2, 6, 10, and 16:

Morishita further disclose:

wherein said releasing key is produced using at least information peculiar to said apparatus. Col. 69, lines 30-40.

As per claims 3, 7, 11, and 17:

Morishita further discloses:

said electronic apparatus is connected with a managing side via a wide-area network; and the managing side carries out the releasing key operation by remote control. Fig. 8.

As per claims 4, 8, 14, and 20:

Morishita further discloses:

said program storing section stores a plurality of second programs; and

with respect to a certain combination of said second programs, said system managing section renders said second programs implementable by only one releasing-key operation. Col. 14, lines 12-67

As per claims 9 and 15:

Morishita discloses:

a program storing section for storing a first program for controlling basic operations of said electronic apparatus so that basic operations of the apparatus are executed by controlling elements of the apparatus via the first program, and a second program that is a subroutine and is accessed in said first program so as to control an additional operation of said electronic apparatus so that the second program controls the additional operation that is different than the basic operations controlled by the first program, wherein the second program becomes available via elements of the apparatus that can execute the basic operations via the first program. Col. 15, lines 50-67, Col. 16, lines 1-67, Col. 20, lines 1-18, and Fig. 14.

a control section for implementing a desired operation by executing only said first program, or both said first and second programs; Col. 4, lines 25-37 and Fig. 9

Morishita discloses the claimed invention except for the a system managing section that, in response to a releasing key operation, makes said second program permanently accessible by said first program, and said management system comprising a key issuing section on a managing side, said key issuing section issuing said releasing key upon confirming that a predetermined procedure has been conducted by

a user side. However, Morishita teaches about the use of keys for accessing information. Col. 25, lines 37-46, and Col. 34, lines 15-19.

Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide a system managing section that, in response to a releasing key operation, makes said second program permanently accessible by said first program, said management system comprising a key issuing section on a managing side, said key issuing section issuing said releasing key upon confirming that a predetermined procedure has been conducted by a user side. Col. 53-56, lines 1-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the software use method control system of Morishita with the system managing section that, in response to a releasing key operation, makes said second program permanently accessible by said first program, said management system comprising a key issuing section on a managing side, said key issuing section issuing said releasing key upon confirming that a predetermined procedure has been conducted by a user side of Ginter, in order to provide the control and security required to insure proper protocol is followed to use the software program.

Morishita discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for disclosing wherein said first program is accessible and operable both before and after the releasing key operation. However, the Examiner submits that both the main programs in the Application and the Prior Art remain functional because neither of them teaches about the changes in the original operating program that would affect their accessibility or operability after the releasing operation. In fact, the Examiner submits

Art Unit: 3621

that the original operating programs of the Application and the Prior Art by definition must maintain their operability because the purpose of the release key operation is to expand/complement the original operating program.

In reference to, wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program. It is well known that a person having ordinary skill in the art that the concept of shareware, i.e. providing a demo or short version of a program for non-restricted use, requires a key to access the rest of the program. Morishita teaches about the copyright owner creating protected software, which can be used by his specified use method. Col. 19, lines 50-54. Morishita further teaches encoding a key with the personal ID of the owner, the software ID and the user's personal ID. Col. 25, lines 37-50.

Merkle teaches that it is known in the art to provide wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program. Col. 3, lines 28-50. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the software use control system of Morishita with the wherein the second program is a subroutine of the first program of Merkle, in order to promote the use of the program by providing a demo or short version of a program for non-restricted use.

As per claims 12 and 18:

Morishita further discloses:

wherein, on said managing side, said key issuing section issues said releasing key in response to entrance into a use contract or payment of a use fee. Col. 32, lines 1-37.

As per claims 13 and 19:

Morishita further discloses:

wherein history information relating to say said managing side manages issuance of a releasing key. Col. 33, lines 1-45.

As per claim 21:

Morishita further discloses:

wherein said releasing key operation comprises, in response to a request by the electronic apparatus, the electronic apparatus receiving release key information from a service center remote from the electronic apparatus and determining whether the release key information matches release key information stored in memory and if so then making the second program accessible. Col. 7, lines 5-25.

As per claims 22-24:

Claims 22-24 are written in such generic terms that taken in their broadest terms i.e. electronic apparatus is an image forming apparatus (computer monitor), a combination of the image forming apparatus and a peripheral device realizes an image forming system (computer monitor and an associated computer), wherein the first program is a program for controlling the image forming apparatus (drivers for the monitor and associated program) and the second program is a program for controlling the peripheral device that works the image forming apparatus (operating system for the

Art Unit: 3621

computer attached to the monitor) Morishita discloses a system resource **80** comprising a memory, a memory containing a hard disk, an output device such as a display and a printer, and a data-processing devices such as a CPU, a coprocessor and an extension board.

As previously noted, incorporating into the claims the structures/descriptions of the apparatus capabilities and functions i.e. scanner, fax machine, printer, etc., would provide for specific limitations and limit the interpretation of the claims.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 571-272-6707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.


Art Unit: 3621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel L. Greene
Examiner
Art Unit 3621

11/3/2005



Primary Examiner
AU 3621